

## REMARKS

The examiner objected to claims 12-16, but indicated that such claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 12 and 13 are each presented herein in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 14-16 depend from claim 13.

The examiner objected to the drawings and claim 8 since the figures did not show the bolt receiving recess as an annular groove. Applicants respectfully submit that the figures as amended address the examiner's concern. No new matter is added as the original specification states in paragraph 0019 that “[t]he shaft receiving recess 54 is similar to the bolt receiving recess 24 of the prior art shaft 20 . . . .” Paragraph 0003 explains that “the shaft 20 has a notch, annular groove or other form of bolt receiving recess 24 . . . .” Furthermore, original claims 8 and 18 each describe the bolt receiving recess as an annular groove.

The examiner also objected to claim 9 as containing informal, subjective language. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9 as amended addresses the examiner's concern.

The examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 7, 9, 10 and 17-18 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,090,833 (Oertle et al.). The examiner rejected claims 3 and 11 as being obvious in view of Oertle et al. in view of any of U.S. Patent No. 6,155,739 (Sekine et al.), U.S. Patent No. 4,628,758 (Yuzuriha et al.) or U.S. Patent No. 5,788,400 (Wey). The examiner rejected claims 8 and 18 as being obvious in view of Oertle et al. in view of Yuzuriha et al. or U.S. Patent No. 4,899,611 (Pinna). Applicants respectfully traverses these rejections.

Independent claims 1 and 9 each recite an axial shaft body having a shaft body forward end and at least one projection extending axially from the shaft forward end. The Oertle et al.

projection P relied upon by the examiner does not extend axially, but instead extends radially. None of the remaining cited references overcome the deficiencies of Oertle et al. None of the cited references, alone or in any reasonable combination, teach or suggest the claimed invention.

It is respectfully submitted that pending claims 1-3 and 7-18 are in condition for allowance. Early reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

If the examiner believes an interview, either telephonic or in person, will advance the prosecution of this matter, it is respectfully submitted that the examiner get in contact with the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Glenn M. Massina  
Reg. No. 40,081

Docket No.: 091395-9214 (4596-TC-AU)  
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP  
3773 Corporate Parkway Suite 360  
Center Valley, Pennsylvania 18034

610-798-2170